



# भारत का राजपत्र

# The Gazette of India

भासाधारण

EXTRAORDINARY

भाग I—खण्ड 1

PART I—Section 1

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं. 62] तदृश दिल्ली बूहस्यतिकार अप्रैल 4, 1968/चंद्रघ्नेष्ठ 15, 1890

No. 62] NEW DELHI, THURSDAY, APRIL 4, 1968/CHAITRA 15, 1890

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ मंड्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके।

Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed  
as a separate compilation.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT &amp; REHABILITATION

(Department of Labour &amp; Employment)

NOTIFICATION

New Delhi, the 3rd April 1968

No. F.55(43)/66-LRIV.—In continuation of the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) notification No. S.O. 920, dated the 19th February, 1968, published at pages 1 to 309 in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary Part II Section 3 Sub-section (ii), dated the 5th March, 1968, the Central Government hereby publishes the Order dated the 27th March, 1968 of Shri T. L. Venkatarama Aiyar, Arbitrator, on a petition before him under Rule 28 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 in arbitration proceeding under section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Reserve Bank of India (and its workmen employees in Classes II and III).

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE ARBITRATOR, SHRI T. L. VENKATARAMA AIYAR,  
RETIRED SUPREME COURT JUDGE**

(Reference under Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

**BETWEEN**

**The Reserve Bank of India**

**AND**

**Its workmen Employees in Class II and III**

**Award dated 12th February, 1968**

Petition under Rule 28 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957.

*Bombay, the 27th March 1968*

**ORDER**

On 22nd of March 1968, Shri K. T. Sule appearing on behalf of the All-India Reserve Bank Employees' Association filed a petition asking for an opportunity to file objections to the Award with respect to alleged mistakes and on that I passed an Order set out in Annexure I. Pursuant to that Order, the Association has filed a petition before me setting out various objections to the Award. Copy of this petition has been served on the Bank. At the hearing of the petition today, Shri Sule appeared on behalf of the Association in support of it; Shri N. V. Phadke opposed it on behalf of the Bank. A representative of the All-India Reserve Bank Workers' Organisation also appeared before me and while maintaining that the question of the Index should not be re-opened, supported the Association with respect to the alleged mistakes and slips.

2. Before considering the objections on the merits it will be useful to refer to the arguments addressed before me on the scope of Rule 28 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957.

The rule runs as follows:—

**"The Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or arbitrator may correct any clerical mistake or error arising from an accidental slip or omission in any award it/he issues."**

The argument of Shri Sule on behalf of the Association is that the words "any clerical mistake or error arising from an accidental slip or omission" should be read disjunctively and that even errors in expressing the intention of the Arbitrator could be corrected. On behalf of the Bank Shri Phadke contends that the rule should be construed strictly and, in support of his argument, relies on the decision in *Sutherland and Company v. Hannevig Brothers Ltd.*, [1921(1)K.B. 336]. In that case an Arbitrator who had ordered costs in favour of one of the disputants amended it subsequently by providing that the party was entitled to the whole of the costs and not merely a part. The reason given by the Arbitrator was that that was his real intention. It was held by the High Court that the order of amendment was without jurisdiction. Reference was also made to the decision of the Supreme Court in *Master Construction Company vs. State of Orissa* under Rule 83 of the Orissa Sales Tax Rules, 1947, (A.I.R. 1966 S.C. 1047). In that case the Commissioner of Sales Tax who had passed an order directing a refund of excess sales tax paid by a party subsequently amended it by ordering refund subject to certain deductions. The question was whether this was a clerical mistake or a slip within Rule 83, such as would give jurisdiction to the Commissioner to amend the earlier order. It was held by the Supreme Court that the rule in question did not authorise a reconsideration of the question on the merits or permit reargument on grounds not urged before. There is no doubt as to the law on the subject. It will not be open to the authority acting under rule 28 to allow any amendment relating to the merits of the decision. It is only when there is a mistake or omission in the nature of an error or slip that the jurisdiction under the rule can be invoked. Where the mistake is, as for example, in typing the draft or in printing it, it would obviously fall within the rule. Where the contention relates purely to the merits of the case, it will fall outside it. A difficult question might arise where the language of the Award does not correctly reflect what was intended to be decided. It is in this class of cases that there is scope for divergence of judicial opinion.

The decisions in such cases turn generally on the facts of each case. The law on the subject was thus stated in the judgment of the Supreme Court cited above:—

"An arithmetical mistake is a mistake of calculation; a clerical mistake is a mistake in writing or typing. An error arising out of or occurring from an accidental slip or omission is an error due to a careless mistake or omission unintentionally made..... The accidental slip or omission is an accidental slip or omission made by the court. The obvious instance is a slip or omission to embody in the order something which the court in fact ordered to be done. This is sometimes described as a decretal order not being in accordance with the judgment. But the slip or omission may be attributed to the Judge himself. He may say something or omit to say something which he did not intend to say or omit. This is described as a slip or omission in the judgment itself. The cause for such a slip or omission may be Judge's inadvertence or the advocate's mistake."

Bearing these principles in mind, I shall now proceed to deal with the several points raised by the Association in the petition in the order in which they are stated therein:—

1. Stenographers.—It is common ground that Stenographers form a promotional grade from Typists. Conformably to this, under the Desai Award, the maximum was fixed at Rs. 430/- for Typists, that for Stenographers Grade II at Rs. 450/-, and for Stenographers Grade I at Rs. 485/-. Under the present Award, the maximum pay of the Typist is Rs. 540/-, and that of Stenographer Grade I Rs. 600/-. The Typists are given a Special Pay of Rs. 15/- p.m. from the very beginning, and in addition thereto, a Special Pay of Rs. 20/- p.m. after nine years. On behalf of the Association it is pointed out that in view of the Special Pay of Rs. 35/-, the Typists get more than Stenographers Grade II though the latter are a promotional grade. The answer of the Bank to this contention is that when a Typist is promoted as a Stenographer Grade II, his pay in the higher grade will not, under the rules of fitment, suffer in fact any diminution. But even so, the anomaly will remain, of the substantive pay in the promotional cadre being less than that of the lower cadre. It is the contention of the Bank that this question is one relating to the merits of the decision and not involving any mistake or slip. But the facts relating to this matter are somewhat unusual. The pay scale fixed in this original draft for Typists did not include the Special Pay of Rs. 20/- p.m., and when the draft was revised, by inclusion of that amount, it was noticed that the position of the Stenographer Grade II, as belonging to a promotional cadre, should be readjusted and that for that purpose, it would be sufficient to increase the span in his case to 18 years and include this, as a category by itself and by a slip this decision was not incorporated in the final draft. This is a mistake which should be rectified. That will be done by inserting the category of Stenographer Grade II, as Group II-B with the scale as follows:—

(i) At page 238 of the Award, read "Group II-A" for "Group II".

(ii) "Group II-B":

1. Stenographer Grade II	Rs.	<u>230</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>320</u>	—EB	<u>15</u>	<u>335</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>460</u>	—EB
		<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>			<u>1</u>		<u>5</u>		
					— <u>25</u>	<u>585</u>				

(18 years)"

(iii) Group III will be amended by omitting Stenographers and other consequential changes made.

2. Caretaker Grade II.—This is a promotional grade for Assistant Caretakers and accordingly, under the Desai Award, the maximum pay of Caretaker Grade II was Rs. 430/-, while that of the Assistant Caretaker was Rs. 420/-. Under the present Award the maximum for the Caretaker Grade II is Rs. 535/- while that of the Assistant Caretaker is Rs. 540/-. This is clearly a case of mistake. In this case also a decision had been taken to increase the span of Caretaker Grade II to 14 years and by a slip this has not been carried out. This amendment will be carried out and the consequential corrections made.

3. Air-Conditioning Plant and Electrical Supervisor.—Under the present Award, the scale of the Electrician Grade I is Rs. 230—560 and that of the Air-Conditioning Plant and Electrical Supervisor Rs. 310—550. The Association contends that the Electrician Grade I is promoted as Air-Conditioning Plant and Electrical Supervisor and that therefore the scale of fees for the latter must be higher and that accordingly the present scale of Air-Conditioning Plant and Electrical

Supervisor, which is less than that of Electrician Grade I; is a mistake. The Bank denies that Air-Conditioning Plant and Electrical Supervisor is a promotional cadre. This is not a case of mistake.

**4. Clerks Grade I.**—Under the Desai Award the scale of pay for Clerks Grade I was Rs. 150-420 plus Rs. 12 as Special Pay while that of the Typist was Rs. 165-430. Under the present Award the scale for both Clerks Grade I and Typists is the same; but while the Special Pay for Clerks Grade I is Rs. 20, that of the Typists is Rs. 35, at the maximum. The contention of the Association is that this is a mistake and that the scale of Clerks Grade I should be raised so as to give him a lead. But there is no mistake whatsoever in this matter. It was pressed by the Association that in view of the strenuous nature of the work of Typists and want of adequate promotional avenues to them, they should receive special consideration. This contention has been accepted and there is no question of mistake.

**5. Junior Draftsman.**—Under the Desai Award, the maximum pay admissible for the Junior Draftsman and the Typist was the same. Under the present Award the Typists get, at the maximum, Rs. 35 p.m. more. The Association submits that there is no ground for making a distinction between them, that the fixing of a lower maximum for the Junior Draftsman is a mistake and that this should be corrected. The difference is the result of valuation of the respective jobs of the two categories. There is no mistake.

**6(A) Telephone Operator Grade I.**—Under the Desai Award, the maximum pay for both the Telephone Operators G. I and Typists was Rs. 430. Under the present Award the maximum for the Telephone Operators Grade I is Rs. 560, whereas that of the Typists is Rs. 575. The contention of the Association is that the maximum pay of the Telephone Operators Grade I should be the same as that of the Typists. I am unable to see any mistake in this.

**6(B) Comptometer Operator and Adrema Machine Operator**—and

**6(C) Sorter Operator, Tabulator Operator and Fund Machine Operator.**—The substance of the complaint with reference to these categories is that under the revised scale the employees will get less than what they would be entitled to get under the Desai Award, that this was not intended and is therefore a mistake that should be rectified. The whole of this argument rests on a comparison of the dearness allowance under the Working Class Index and that under the Middle Class Index, and is really one relating to the merits of the decision. There is no mistake justifying modification.

**7. Special Pay of Rs. 20/- for the Categories who have inadequate or no avenues of promotion.**—The Association claims that the Special Pay of Rs. 20/- p.m. given to Typists should be given to certain other categories of employees also on the ground that they stand on the same footing as Typists in that they have no adequate promotional avenues. There is no mistake whatsoever in this. The Typists have been given a Special Pay on account of the nature of their job, as also, on account of their inadequate promotional avenues.

**8. Punch Operators.**—This is clearly a case of mistake. In para. 3.125, their Special Pay is fixed at Rs. 25 but under para 3.142 at page 239, it is stated as Rs. 20. It ought to be Rs. 25 p.m.

**9(A) Special fitment given under the Fitment Formula to those whose starting scales under the Desai Award were higher than the clerical scale.**—The Association claims that initial increments ought to be given to certain specified categories of workmen and that the failure to do so is a mistake. But it will be seen from paragraph 4.5 that the question of fitment has been considered from all stand points, that in some cases one increment has been given, in others, two, and in certain other cases, Special Pay. There is no mistake.

**9(B) Protection of total emoluments under the Desai Award.**—The Award provides that persons who, on the date of fitment, get less under this Award, than what they were getting under the Desai Award, should be paid the difference as 'Personal Allowance'. The Association demands that a similar direction should be given as regards the emoluments even subsequent to the date of fitment, if they are less. The Bank strongly opposes the claim and contends that its adoption would result in the existence of two parallel schemes running side by side for years and years. It is sufficient for the present purpose to say that there is no mistake which could be corrected under Rule 28.

**10. Middle Class Index.**—The Association asserts that there has been a mistake in the rate of neutralisation given in the Award with reference to Dearness Allowance. It is said that 75 per cent of neutralisation applying the Working

Class Index, as per Desai Award, would work out at 112.96 per cent in terms of the Middle Class Index and that the rate of 90 per cent and 75 per cent neutralisation is therefore a mistake. The Bank points out that the 75 per cent Working Class Index has reference to the fixation of the wages for the basic year, 1960, and that the fixation of 90 per cent and 75 per cent for dearness allowance during the subsequent years is quite a different subject and that the two have no connection. This is really a question turning on the merits of the decision. No question of mistake is involved.

**10(A) Graduate Allowance and C.A.I.I.B. Allowance:** and

**10(B) Increments.**—The contention of the Association that the Special Pay prescribed for employees passing certain examinations is really much less than what is intended to be awarded in view of the lower Middle Class Index figures, raises, again, a question on the merits. So, also the question of increments. No mistake is involved.

**10(C) Departure from Bipartite Settlement which has been accepted as the basis for fixation of wages of workmen employees of the Reserve Bank of India.**—Lastly, it is said that though the Award decides that the emoluments under this Award should be comparable with those of the commercial banks under the Bipartite Settlement, in fact, they are not comparable. The question is considered in the Award in Chapter III and the result summed up in para 3.143 and Appendix 'D' sets out the comparative emoluments as on 1st January 1966. The real complaint appears to be that as the result of the Middle Class Index figure being less than the Working Class Index figures, the emoluments are comparatively less. There is no mistake in the figures as given as on 1st January 1966, nor is there a clerical or arithmetical error open for correction. I should mention that in the course of the hearing the Association filed five statements with the object of showing that under the present Award the emoluments of some of the employees are by comparison less than under the Desai Award. The correctness of the statements has not been admitted by the Bank and in view of the fact that this raises only a question on the merits and not on any mistake, I consider it unnecessary to pursue the matter further.

The representative of the Organisation, who has appeared at this hearing has argued that there is a mistake in the finding relating to House Rent Allowance and that where the employee is accommodated in a tenement belonging to the Bank, he should be charged, not as at present, 15 per cent of the 'pay' as rent **but only 5 per cent.** This claim relates to the merits of the decision and is not a mistake.

In Annexure II, (*Errata et Corrigenda*) are set out all the mistakes, errors and slips including clerical and printing mistakes, with corrections.

(Sd.) T. L. VENKATARAMA AIYAR.

H-22, 'Badhwar Park'.  
Colaba, Bombay.

Arbitrator.

**ANNEXURE I**

**BEFORE THE HONOURABLE ARBITRATOR, SHRI T. L. VENKATARAMA AIYAR  
RETIRED SUPREME COURT JUDGE**

(Reference under Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

**BETWEEN**

**The Reserve Bank of India**

**AND**

Its workmen employees in Class II and III.

**Re: Memorandum dated 22nd March 1968 submitted by the  
All-India Reserve Bank Employees' Association  
Madras, dated 22nd March 1968**

**ORDER**

In this arbitration reference, the Award was signed by me on the 12th February 1968 and sent to the Central Government and it has been published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, dated 5th March 1968. Shri Sule, on behalf of the Asso-

ciation has submitted a memorandum in which it is said that there are certain anomalies, errors and omissions in the Award as published which call for correction. Now it is well settled that the Award is final once it is signed and it is not open to review on the merits but that if there are clerical mistakes, errors, or slips, they can be corrected. Shri Sule concedes that position. Therefore, it is open to me to correct only what are strictly speaking, clerical mistakes, errors or slips. In this view, Shri Sule proposes to file a list setting out the errors, mistakes and slips, with specific reference to specific paragraphs of the Award. Under Sections 20(3) read with 17A(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the proceedings would be pending before me for 30 days after the publication of the Award. I have, therefore, power to correct the errors at any time before the 5th of April 1968. I accordingly direct that the Association do prepare a petition setting out the errors, mistakes and slips with respect to which amendments might be required, and serve a copy thereof on the Bank, on or before Monday, the 25th of March 1968. On the 27th of March 1968 the said petition will be heard by me at H-22, 'Badhwar Park', Colaba, Bombay at 3-00 p.m. The Bank also will be given notice thereon. The petition will be considered by me and appropriate orders passed and the amendments to the Award, if any, as finally decided by me will be sent to the Central Government.

**'Sri Vidya Vilas'**  
81, Mowbray's Road, Alwaret, Madras.

(Sd.) T. L. VENKATARAMA AIYAR,  
Arbitrator.

22nd March 1968.

Copy to:—

- (1) The Chief Manager, Reserve Bank of India, Central Office, Department of Administration and Personnel Bombay-1.
- (2) The General Secretary, All-India Reserve Bank Employees' Association, c/o Reserve Bank of India, Bombay-1.

#### ANNEXURE II

##### *Errata et Corrigenda*

Sl. No.	Page No. of the Gazette	Para No.	Line No.	Error	Correction
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	184	..	11	"14"	"14th"
2	184	1·2	9	"Association to"	"Association, to"
3	185	2·1	1	"narate"	"narrate"
4	185	2·2	25	"Justice P.B. Gajendragadkar"	"Justice Shri P.B. Gajendragadkar"
5	186	2·4	4	"in September 1954"	"in 1954"
6	188	3·5	28	"employer. "and"	"employer," and"
7	189	3·10	10	"increase in"	"increase the"
8	190	3·12	8	"The factions"	"The functions"
9	191	3·15	7	"financial, matters,"	"financial matters,"
10	191	3·15	16	"that Act is"	"that Act, is"
11	192	3·16	20	"entered into. in"	"entered into, in"
12	192	3·16	23	"will lie"	"will lie...."
13	192	3·17	24	"etc. and"	"etc., and"
14	192	3·17	27	"1964 (3) S.C.R. 624, (A.I.R.)"	"(1964 (3) S.C.R. 624, A.I.R.)"

Sl. No.	Page No. of the Gazette	Para No.	Line No.	Error	Correction
1	2	3	4	5	6
15	193	3·18	14	“penson”	“person”
16	193	3·20	1	“In my view.”	“In my view,”
17	193	3·20	10	“any business trade under- taking manufacture,”	“any business, trade, undertaking, manu- facture,”
18	193	3·20	11	“any calling.”	“any calling,”
19	195	3·24	7	“work. in”	“work, in”
20	195	3·24	27	“In that case.”	“ In that case,”
21	195	3·25	15	“para. 4,166).”	“para. 4.166).”
22	195	3·27	3	“Now. the”	“Now, the”
23	196	3·29	7	“words comparable”	“words, comparable”
24	198	3·34	11	“as that”	“and that”
25	199	3·34	3	“against”	“again”
26	200	3·37	22	“Government. that”	“Government, that”
27	201	3·40	12	“that “Assurances. however,”	“that “Assurances, however,”
28	201	3·41	8	“pay house rent,”	“pay, house rent,”
29	201	3·42	1	“Ext.”	“Exs.”
30	202	3·42	10	“besides.”	“besides,”
31	202	3·43	28	“that”	“than”
32	203	3·44	3	“not”	“no”
33	204	3·48	32	“base-year and”	“base-year; and”
34	204	3·49	17	“concerns is.”	“concerns is,”
35	205	3·52	1	“class,”	“calss.”
36	206	3·54	14	“all all-India”	“an all-India”
37	207	3·54	1	“observed;”	“observed:”
38	207	3·56	5	“base year”	“base year,”
39	208	3·59	11	“Expenditure pattern, which form the principle”	“Expenditure pattern, which form the principal”
40	208	3·61	5	“drawn a single”	“drawn from a single”
41	208	3·61	8/9	“internaly”	“internally”
42	208	3·61	21	“smaples.”	“samples.”
43	210	3·64	4	“te”	“the”
44	210	3·66	2/3	“method and the other the interview method. The former consists in asking as a safe basis”	“method which was ad- opted in the Survey is defective and cannot be accepted as a safe basis”
45	210	3·66	11	“also;”	“also;”
46	211	3·66	17	“1966 I L.L.J. 1 at 25]. Besides,”	“1966 I L.L. J. 1 at 2: “Besides,”
47	211	3·67	6	“disadvantage.”	“disadvantage,”
48	212	3·70	14	“work.”	“work,”
49	213	3·72	5	“features”	“feature”
50	214	3·77	6/7	“monthby”	“monthly”
51	215	3·78	6	“groups and”	“groups; and”
52	216	3·80	11	“and footwear;”	“and footwear;”
53	216	3·80	38	“7·1 to 7·4”	“7·1 to 7·4”
54	216	3·81	16	“Its.”	“Rs.”

Sl. No.	Page No. of the Gazette	Para No.	Line No.	Error	Correction
1	2	3	4	5	6
55	217	3·81	6/7	"therein"	"therein,"
56	217	3·81	7	"favouraby"	"favourably"
57	217	3·82	5	"pblished"	"published"
58	217	3·83	1	"inex"	"index"
59	217	3·83	2	"mvements"	"movements"
60	217	3·83	29	" bisk"	"brisk"
61	218	3·85	9	"so,"	"so."
62	219	3·89	12	"I should and "	"I should add"
63	220	3·92	1	"as what"	"as to what"
64	220	3·92	4	"2·25"	"2·25"
65	220	3·92	7	"para. 65)."'	"para. 65),"'
66	220	3·92	16	"2·25"	"2·25"
67	220	3·94	2	"captain"	"caption"
68	221	3·94	19	"The Association,"	"....The Association,"
69	221	3·95	5	"prepared vide"	"prepared (vide)"
70	221	3·97	10	"paid 5 per cent."	"paid 15 per cent."
71	221	3·98	8	"Commission"	"Commission,"
72	221	3·98	9/10	"make for different levels"	"make for differences at different levels"
73	222	3·99	3	"Government State"	"Government, State"
74	222	3·99	7	"repercussion"	"repercussions"
75	222	3·101	5	"Tallers"	"Tellers"
76	223	3·103	7	"in order"	"an order"
77	225	3·106	5	"recommended"	"recommend"
78	225	3·106	8	"frequently"	"frequency"
79	225	1·108	22 (Table No. I)	"23 Year(s)"	"(23 years)"
80	226	3·108	10 (Table No. I)	"Telex Operator,"	"Telex Operator,"
81	226	3·108	15 (Table No. I)	"Cmoptometer Operator"	"Comptometer Operator"
82	227	3·108	Below Line 10	..	" *Post-Desai Category"      Award
83	227	3·108	25 (Table No. I)	" (21 years )"	"( 21 Years )"
84	227	3·108	33 (Table No. I) Typist	"Rs. 155/1—5/2—165— 8/2—191— 10/1—191—EB—10/3—221— 12/4—269—EB—15/2—299— 16/6—395"	"Rs.155/1—5/2—165— 8/2—181— 10/1—191—E.B.—10/3— 221—12/4—269—EB— 15/2—299—16/6—395"

Sl. No.	Page No. of the Gazette	Para No.	Line No.	Error	Correction
1	2	3	4	5	6
85	228	3·10	2 (Table No. I) Steno- grapher Grade II	"Rs. 175/1—10/4—215— 12/3—215—EB—12/2— 275—20/7—415"	"Rs. 175/1—10/4—215— 12/3—251—EB—12/2— 275—20/7—415"
86	228	3·108	25 (Table No. I)	"Punch Operator"	"Punch Operator,"
87	228	3·108	32 (Table No. I)	"Ad-hoc-Allowances"	"Ad-hoc Allowance"
88	232	3·113	9	" years of service."	" years of service, and on crossing the first effi- ciency bar."
89	232	3·120	5	" in the Railways"	" " in the Railways"
90	233	3·123	3	" Jurisdiction"	" Justification"
91	234	3·125	2	" on Ja par Assistants"	" on par with Assistants"
92	234	3·128	13	" R-67"	" A-67"
93	235	3·130	5	" As"	" A"
94	235	3·130	9	" Rs. 15/- per mensem"	" Rs. 20/- per mensem"
95	236	3·134	20	" Group III on a scale of Rs. 230—560"	" Group IIB on a scale of Rs. 230—585"
96	236	3·136	6	" Photostate"	" Photostat"
97	236	3·138	2	" varous"	" various"
98	237	3·140	1	" Grade I and II"	" Grades I and II"
99	238	3·142	5 (Table No. 4)	"Category of Staff"	"Categories of Staff"
100	238	3·142	32 (Table No. 4)	" Group II"	" Group II A"
101	238	3·142	Below Line 34 (Table No. 4)	..	" Group II B : 1. Stenographer Gr. II.
					Rs. 230/1—15/6—320— EB—15/1—335—25/5— 460—EB—25/5—585. (18 years)"
102	238	3·142	39 (Table No. 4)	"3. Stenographer Grade II."	Delete this portion.
103	238	3·142	41 (Table No. 4)	"1. Caretaker Grade II."	"1. Caretaker Gr. II.
				Rs. 275/1—15/4—335— 25/1—360—EB— 25/7—535 (13 years)"	Rs. 275/1—15/4—335—25/1 360—EB—25/8—560. (14 years)"
104	239	3·142	45 (II Special pay)	"9. Punch Operator.. Rs. 20/-"	"9. Punch Operator.. Rs. 25/-"

Sl. No.	Page No. of the Gazette	Para No.	Line No.	Error	Correction
1	2	3	4	5	6
105	239	3·142	46 (II Special pay)	"Io. Auto-Verifier Operator.. Rs. 20/-"	"Io. Auto-Verifier Operator.. Rs. 25/-."
106	241	4·3	3	"A.I.R. 1963 1327,"	"A.I.R. 1963 S.C. 1327"
107	241	4·5	11	" Operator."	" Operator,"
108	242	4·5	14	" is "	" are "
109	242	5·1	13	" wre "	" were "
110	242	5·2	7	" Salary "	" Sastry "
111	244	5·8	7	" of lump sum "	" of a lump sum "
112	244	5·11	7	" examination "	" examinations "
113	245	6·1	10/11	" per mensem "	" per mensem,"
114	246	7·2	11	" approved " the principle"	" approved the principle"
115	246	7·2	13	" Allowance ", (page "	" Allowance, (page "
116	246	7·2	34	" Stepply "	" steeply "
117	246	7·2	43	" allowed "	" allowed,"
118	247	7·2	4	" Dearness Allowance "	" Dearness Allowance."
119	247	7·3	10	" Middle Class Index."	" Middle Class Index,"
120	247	7·3	17	" when the basic pay "	" when the pay "
121	247	7·3	18	" for the basic pay "	" for the pay "
122	247	7·4	23	" Special pay, and officiating pay"	" special pay, personal pay and officiating pay "
123	248	8·3	4	"Rs. 30 "	"Rs. 300"
124	248	8·3	7	" Delhi "	" New Delhi"
125	248	8·3	12/13 (in the table under the column 'pay')	"Rs. 100 to Rs. 300/-"	"Rs. 100 to Rs. 3000/-"
126	249	8·8	8	"(page 83, "	" (page 89, "
127	249	8·10	1	" I am "	" I am "
128	250	8·11	16	" have ' in addition "	" have, in addition "
129	250	8·12	8/9	"special pay and officiating pay	"special pay, personal pay and officiating pay"
130	250	Below para		"II. travelling and Halting Allowance :"	"II. travelling and Halting Allowances :"
		8·14			
131	252	8·22	11	" he rate of "	" the rate of "
132	252	8·22	17	" he station "	" the station "
133	252	8·23	3	" Rs. 2·50 "	" Rs. 2·50 "
134	252	8·23	5	" whereas "	" whereas "
135	252	8·23	9	" the "	" The "
136	253	8·24	14	" circumstances "	" circumstances,"
137	253	8·24	17	" should have "	" should have,"
138	253	8·24	18	" on tour "	" on tour,"

Sl. No.	Page No. of the Gazette'	Para No.	Line No.	Error	Correction
1	2	3	4	5	6
139	253	8·26	3	"wife"	"wife"
140	253	8·28	4	"is that"	"is that,"
141	253	8·28	8	"service"	"service,"
142	254	8·29	14	"elonging"	"belonging"
143	255	8·32	11	"as if it a"	"as if it were a"
144	255	8·34	(below para.)	"out side station;"	"outside station;"
145	255	8·35	2	"Workman"	"Workmen"
146	255	8·36	5	"draws less"	"draws less,"
147	256	8·39	7	"5:31"	"5·31"
148	257	8·41	2	"in a month"	"is a month"
149	257	8·42	6	"cantonment area"	"cantonment area,"
150	257	8·43	6	"diem."	"diem,"
151	257	8·43	9	"Centre"	"centre"
152	257	8·44	1	"3·44"	"8·44"
153	257	8·44	1	"my opinion."	"my opinion,"
154	257	8·44	5	"8 kilometers from"	"8 kilometers, or beyond thereof, from"
155	257	8·44	6	"charges"	"charges,"
156	258	8·47	21	"casual leave."	"casual leave,"
157	258	8·48	3	"I often"	"It often"
158	258	8·48	5	"remittance"	"remittance,"
159	258	8·49	9	"training"	"treating"
160	258	8·50	3	"ends"	"end"
161	258	8·50	5	"launch;"	"lunch;"
162	259	8·55	9	"which."	"which,"
163	259	8·55	11	"(page 53, para 178)"	"(page 53, para 178),"
164	260	8·57	8	"that the increment"	"that one increment"
165	260	8·59	1	"Organisation"	"Organisation,"
166	260	8·59	7	"vacancy."	"vacancy,"
167	260	8·59	10	"an it be"	"can it be"
168	260	8·59	22/24	"commerely as regards Sundays and public hol- days but even as regards an intervening pected"	"commendable on the part of the Bank. I think this is the utmost that can be expected"
169	261	9·7	2	"entails"	"entail"
170	261	9·7	7	"shifted."	"shifted,"
171	261	9·7	8	"employers"	"employees"
172	263	11·2	11	"even working" ..	"even on working"
173	263	11·2	14	"Saturdays;"	"Saturdays,"
174	264	11·8	5	"limit of the hour"	"limit of one hour,"
175	264	11·8	7	"Thereafter"	"Thereafter,"
176	264	11·8	8	"is no much".	"is not much".

Sl. No.	Page No. of the Gazette	Para. No.	Line No.	Error	Correction
1	2	3	4	5	6
177	265	11·9	19	"industrial dispute"	"industrial disputes"
178	266	11·14	1	"whose work on"	"whose work is on"
179	266	11·16	4	"they do"	"they do,"
180	266	11·16	13	"such and option"	"such an option"
181	267	11·19	13	"it held;"	"it held:"
182	267	11·19	14	"therewith,"	"therewith" "
183	267	11·19	15	"this decision	"this decision."
184	267	11·19	19	"and they will get overtime"	"and that they should get overtime"
185	267	11·19	22	"overtime allowance, this Award"	"overtime allowance in this Award"
186	267	12·2	16	"Class III who."	"Class III who,"
187	268	12·4	3	"Probationers nd temporary"	"Probationers and temporary"
188	268	12·5	1	"banks' reference."	"banks' reference,"
189	268	12·7	1	"circumstances"	"circumstance"
190	268	12·7	5	"Commission"	"Commission,"
191	269	12·8	10	"late"	"later"
192	269	13·1	31	"14:5"	"14:5"
193	270	13·3	2	"point"	"points"
194	270	13·4	5	"1958 S.C.R. 499, (1958)"	"(1958 S.C.R. 499, 1958"
195	270	13·4	24	"[1964(2) S.C.R. 809"	"[1964(2) S.C.R. 807"
196	270	13·6	5	"Case"	"Cases"
197	270	13·6	7	"Disposd"	"Disposed"
198	271	13·9	3	"enquiries it"	"enquiries is"
199	271	13·9	6	"Court vide"	"Court (vide)"
200	271	13·9	15	"stages."	"stages;"
201	271	13·10	22	"47) vide"	"47), vide"
202	272	13·12	15	"matters"	"matter"
203	273	14·3	4	"employees"	"employee"
204	273	15·1	8	"out"	"but"
205	275	15·8	4	"Constitution"	"Constitution,"
206	276	15·10	1	"wo kmens-employees"	"workmen-employees"
207	276	15·11	6/7	"'Earned' leave"	"'Earned leave'"
208	276	15·12	3	"rules"	"rules."
209	276	15·12	12	"occasions ordinary"	"occasions of ordinary"
210	278	15·22	18	"leave on for"	"leave for"
211	278	15·23	3	"aobve"	"above"
212	278	15·26	4	"on this point."	"on this point:"
213	279	15·29	3	"au horities"	"authorities"
214	280	15·31	3	"eventy-two"	"twenty two"
215	280	15·32	3	"while"	"while"
	280	15·32	19	"commences."	"commences,"
217	280	16·1	10	"palce"	"place"

Sl. No.	Page No. of the Gazette	Para. No.	Line No.	Error	Correction
1	2	3	4	5	6
218	281	16·2	1	“matter”	“matter,”
219	281	16·2	11	“ramily”	“family”
220	281	16·4	5	“Government”	“Government,”
221	282	16·6	8	“unfare”	“unfair”
	282	16·8	5	“dependent”	“dependant”
223	282	16·9	2	“travels”	“travel”
224	283	17·1	1	“Regulation 1958”	“Regulations, 1948”
225	284	17·3	6	“that wages”	“that the wages”.
226	284	17·4	13	“meaical”	“medical”
227	285	17·8	10/11	“however”	“however,”
228	285	17·8	11	“out-patients”	“out-patients.”
229	286	17·13	6	“his”	“this”
230	287	17·14	10	“dependent”	“dependant”
231	288	18·3	2	“case,”	“case”
232	288	18·3	6	“435”	“435”
233	288	18·3	18	“relavant”	“relevant”
234	288	18·5	3	“as”	“has”
235	288	18·5	4	“he Bank”	“the Bank”
236	288	18·5	5	“is business”	“its business”
237	288	18·6	2	“lately”	“latterly”
238	289	18·7	11	“quasi-Governmental”	“a quasi-Governmental”
239	290	18·10	2	“bave”	“leave”
240	291	19·7	2	“Provident Fund”	“Provident Funds”
241	292	19·9	12	“opposite”	“apposite”
242	292	19·10	4	“which”	“while”
243	292	19·12	4	“sufficient that the employee”	“sufficient if the employee”
244	296	19·20	8	“S.C.R. 23”	“S.C.R. 523”
245	297	20·2	14	“Allowances.”	“Allowances,”
246	298	20·2	4	“should.”	“should,”
247	298	20·2	20	“Hill and Fuel Allowances”	“Hill and Fuel Allowances, Provident Fund and Gratuity”

Sl. No.	Page No. of the Gazette	Para. No.	Line No.	Error	Correction
1	2	3	4	5	6

## APPENDIX 'A'

248	299	Item (ii)(b)		"em loyed"	"employed"
249	299	Item (iii)		"if any"	"if any,"
250	299	Item (v)		"of likely"	"or likely"

## APPENDIX 'B'

251	301	1st para.	1	"meangement"	"management"
252	301	2nd para.	2	"pursuancen"	"pursuant"
253	301	,,	9	"466"	"486"
254	301	4th Para.	5	"person"	"persons"

## APPENDIX 'C'

## PART I

255	302	(i) In Kanpur, under the column "Family Size" against the Income Range of Rs. 200—300 for "5·9" substitute "5·8".
256	303	(ii) After Nagpur, for "Aipur" substitute "Jaipur"

## PART II

257	303	2	"Rs. 300—4750".	"Rs. 300—750".
-----	-----	---	-----------------	----------------

Sl. No.	Page No. of the Gazette	Para No.	Line No.	Error	Correction
1	2	3	4	5	6

## APPENDIX 'D'

258      308      In Note No. 2 of Part III of the Appendix for the words "allowance is admissible", substitute the words "Allowance as admissible".

P. M. NAYAK, Addl. Secy.

